

3-7-2016

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet March 2016

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes>

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet March 2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. Paper 321.

<http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/321>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Faculty Senate, 7 March 2016



In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, **Senate Agendas** are calendared for delivery eight to ten working days before Senate meetings, so that all faculty will have adequate time to review and research all action items. In the case of lengthy documents, only a summary will be included with the agenda. Full proposals of curricular proposals are available at the PSU Curricular Tracking System: <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>. If there are questions or concerns about agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the Senate. Items may be pulled from the curricular consent agenda for discussion in Senate up through the end of roll call.

Senators are reminded that the Constitution specifies that the Secretary be provided with the name of his/her Senate alternate. An alternate is another faculty member from the same Senate division as the faculty senator. A faculty member may serve as alternate for more than one senator, but an alternate may represent only one senator at any given meeting. A senator who misses more than three meetings consecutively will be dropped from the Senate roster.

www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate

PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE



To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

From: Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on 7 **March 2016** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- B. * Approval of the Minutes of the 1 February 2016 Meeting: *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
 - * 1. OAA response to February notice of Senate actions: *consent agenda*
 - 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer and Secretary
 - 3. **Discussion item:** cultural competence and diversity action
- D. Unfinished Business
 - 1. Feedback on proposed accelerated learning standards (IFS)
- E. New Business
 - 1. Curricular proposals (Grad Council & UCC)
 - * a-b, c.2-26: *consent agenda*
 - * c.1. Changes to ArH 204-206
 - * 2. Graduate Certificate in Global Supply Chain Management (Grad Council)
 - * 3. Undergraduate Minor in Conflict Resolution (UCC)
 - * 4. Creation of a STEM Institute (EPC)
 - * 5. New incompletes policy (SSC & Grad Council)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
 - 1. President's Report
 - 2. Report on PTR process (Chabon)
 - 3. Report on NWCCU accreditation (Marshall)
 - 4. Quarterly report of Budget Committee (Bowman)
 - 5. Quarterly report of Educational Policy Committee (Padín)
- H. Adjournment

***See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of 1 February 2016 and appendices
- C.1. OAA response to Senate actions for February
- E.1.a, b, c.2-26. Curricular proposals *consent agenda*
- E.1.c.1. Changes to ArH 204-206
- E.2. Proposal for a graduate Certificate in Global Supply Chain Management
- E.3. Proposal for an undergraduate Minor in Conflict Resolution
- E.4. Proposal to create a STEM Institute
- E.5. Proposed new incompletes policy
- G.4. Quarterly report of BC
- G.5. Quarterly report of EPC

FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

2015-16 OFFICERS AND SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

Gina Greco, Presiding Officer

Brad Hansen, Presiding Officer Elect • Bob Liebman, Past Presiding Officer

Richard Beyler, Secretary

Committee Members: Linda George (2016) • David Maier (2016)

Paula Carder (2017) • Alan MacCormack (2017)

Ex officio: Sharon Carstens, Chair, Committee on Committees • Maude Hines, IFS Representative.

****2015-16 FACULTY SENATE (62)****

All Others (9)

Baccar, Cindy	EMSA	2016
Ingersoll, Becki	ACS	2016
*O'Banion, Liane (for Skaruppa)	OAA	2016
†Popp, Karen	OGS	2016
Arellano, Regina	EMSA	2017
Harmon, Steve	OAA	2017
Riedlinger, Carla	EMSA	2017
Kennedy, Karen	ACS	2018
Running, Nicholas	EMSA	2018

College of the Arts (4)

Griffin, Corey	ARCH	2016
†Babcock, Ronald	MUS	2017
Hansen, Brad	MUS	2017
Wendl, Nora	ARCH	2018

CLAS – Arts and Letters (7)

Pease, Jonathan	WLL	2016
Perlmutter, Jennifer	WLL	2016
Childs, Tucker	LING	2017
Clark, Michael	ENG	2017
Greco, Gina	WLL	2017
†Epplin, Craig	WLL	2018
†Jaén Portillo, Isabel	WLL	2018

CLAS – Sciences (8)

Daescu, Dacian	MTH	2016
George, Linda	ESM	2016
Rueter, John	ESM	2016
Elzanowski, Marek	MTH	2017
Stedman, Ken	BIO	2017
†de Rivera, Catherine	ESM	2018
†Flight, Andrew	MTH	2018
Webb, Rachel	MTH	2018

CLAS – Social Sciences (7)

†Carstens, Sharon	ANTH	2016
Padin, Jose	SOC	2016
†Davidova, Evguenia	INTL	2017
Gamburd, Michele	ANTH	2017
Schuler, Friedrich	HST	2017
Chang, Heejun	GEOG	2018
Bluffstone, Randy	ECON	2018

College of Urban and Public Affairs (6)

Brodowicz, Gary	CH	2016
Carder, Paula	IA	2016
*Labissiere, Yves (for Farquhar)	CH	2016
†Schrock, Greg	USP	2017
Yesilada, Birol	PS	2017
Harris, G.L.A.	GOV	2018

Graduate School of Education (4)

†McElhone, Dorothy	ED	2016
De La Vega, Esperanza	ED	2017
*Thieman, Gayle (for Mukhopadhyay)	ED	2017
Farahmandpur, Ramin	ED	2018

Library (1)

†Bowman, Michael	LIB	2017
------------------	-----	------

Maseeh College of Eng. & Comp. Science (5)

*Daim, Tugrul (for Bertini)	ETM	2016
*Siderius, Martin (for Karavanic)	EEN	2016
Maier, David	CS	2017
Monseré, Christopher	CEE	2018
†Tretheway, Derek	MME	2018

Other Instructional (3)

†Lindsay, Susan	IELP	2016
MacCormack, Alan	UNST	2017
Camacho (Reed), Judy	IELP	2018

School of Business Administration (4)

†Layzell, David	SBA	2016
Loney, Jennifer	SBA	2016
Raffo, David	SBA	2017
Dusschee, Pamela	SBA	2018

School of Social Work (5)

Gioia, Sam (for Cotrell)	SSW	2016
†Donlan, Ted	SSW	2017
Taylor, Michael	SSW	2017
Talbott, Maria	SSW	2018
Winters, Katie	RRI	2018

Date: 11 Feb. 2016. New Senators in italics

* **Interim appointment**

† **Member of Committee on Committees**

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 February 2016
Presiding Officer: Gina Greco
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Clark, Daescu, Davidova, de Rivera, Donlan, Duschee, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harmon, Ingersoll, Kennedy, Labissiere, Layzell, Lindsay, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, Monsere, O'Banion, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Webb, Winters

Alternates Present:

Hellermann for Childs, Weber for Daim, Yeigh for De La Vega, Kaimanu for Harris, Thorne for Jaén Portillo, Allen for Loney, Etesami for Tretheway

Members Absent:

Layzell, Mukhopadhyay, Riedlinger, Schuler, Taylor, Wendl, Yesilada

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andrews, Beyler, Chabon, Fountain, Fraire, D. Hansen, Hines, Marrongelle, Natter, Percy, Wiewel

A. ROLL

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **11 January 2016 Minutes** were **approved** as published.
 [Note: the January meeting was rescheduled because the University was closed on 4 January due to inclement weather.]

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 1. OAA Response to December Notice of Senate Actions**, concurrence, was noted [January Agenda Attachment C.1].
- 2. Announcements by the Presiding Officer and Secretary**

The Presiding Officer called attention to the report of the Faculty Development Committee contained in the packet [**February Agenda Attachment G.3**].

3. Research Update and Distinguished Faculty Proposal

Lisa ZURK, Associate Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP), gave an update on research activities, concurrent with Strategic Plan (SP) goal to support excellence in faculty research by assessing, recognizing achievements, and fostering successful activities. [See slides, **February Minutes Appendix C.3.**]

She indicated that RSP has finished a process by which the deans came up with metrics to identify and evaluate productivity. Aims are to communicate expectations to faculty; to recognize faculty who fulfill or exceed expectations; and to connect to resources strategically. A common response is that “What I do isn’t on the list.” A long list is unwieldy, so the result was a smaller list of quantifiable metrics defining baseline levels and aspirations. The next step, according to ZURK, was to collectively identify strategies to foster these goals. She intends to repeat this each year to see how we are going.

Specific measurements vary from college to college, ZURK pointed out. She referred to three examples. One metric is external funding, prominent in hard science and engineering. A chart showed departments with more than \$1 million in funded research expenditures. Some units are nationally competitive, on a par with top institutions in the country, ZURK asserted. Total funding is just under \$60 million; it pays for graduate students; faculty and staff salaries; conference travel; professional development; and labs and equipment. The funding enriches the environment for faculty and students. ZURK continued: another metric is students, particularly doctoral students. The advanced education component separates our institution from other teaching and community outreach institutions. She referred to a calculation that the university spent about \$8 million per year on graduate (not just doctoral) students: an important part of PSU’s access mission. As a third metric example ZURK mentioned publication citations, and thanked the librarians and in particular Jill EMERY for the compilation of data. According to ZURK, this metric shows the impact of our work.

ZURK turned to the distinguished faculty designation, which arose in the strategic planning process, specifically the research task team. She indicated that two or three dozen institutions nationally have a designation of this kind. A draft proposal received review and feedback from various quarters: provost, deans, Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The proposal is that it be capped at 5% of the faculty population, based on impact and recognition of scholarship on a national and international level. The result is recognition and promotion, and a \$2000 annual stipend (not a one-time award).

ZURK stated that RSP is also looking at ways to support research by junior faculty. “Let knowledge serve the city,” according to ZURK, means that we are invested in growing our knowledge base. The SP mandates that we identify a strategy, share it with the community, and grow it appropriately.

TALBOTT asked if the distinguished faculty proposal had gone through bargaining.

ZURK replied that based on feedback, e.g. from the Steering Committee, about the complexities of making this a rank, it was decided not to make it a formally bargained rank (though that is an option within the Oregon Administrative Rules designations).

TALBOTT said it sounded like merit pay, but not determined by faculty. ZURK said that the stipend would be a bonus outside of base pay. TALBOTT then asked who would decide: again, it was seeming not led by faculty. ZURK replied that the mechanisms are still to be determined as the proposal moves forward. It is meant as a recognition for distinguished work.

MAIER noted that there are named professorships which carry stipends with them; the proposal seemed to him in that spirit.

4. Discussion Item: “What does it mean to be educated in the 21st century?”

GRECO said that the discussion topic did not really have a name. As she had thought about this topic previously, she had referred to it as “liberal arts” but this ran into the misconception that it applied only to the humanities, even though the term properly includes both humanities and sciences. A newer term, “liberal education,” more adequately conveys both breadth and depth; she was told, however, that this still carries limiting connotations. The term “general education” would lead to a war between those who are for and against University Studies. So the discussion has no formal name.

Referring to slides [**February Minutes Appendix C.4**] GRECO formulated as starting questions: What should a PSU graduate be able to do? Where are we succeeding in this? How can we expand on that? Where are we failing our students, and how can we reverse that? We are failing our students, GRECO asserted: 400-level students who have trouble writing a paper with grammatical accuracy, or students who don’t know how they are doing in a class because they don’t understand and can’t calculate the weighted grades of various assignments. If they can’t calculate percentages, GRECO asked, how are they set up for life to make personal financial decisions, read and understand electoral measures, etc.? Realizing that she can’t teach every French student math, she has started putting all grades in the D2L gradebook [which does the calculations automatically], but she still sees this as a failure in that she has to feed the information to students in a computer-processed manner, without their actually having an understanding of the numbers.

GRECO was unable to be at the Winter Symposium due to illness, but from the videos and notes of the event she extracted three themes.

1. Humanity: to empower students to be better people, to fulfill their potential, to have a sense of purpose, to understand what it means to be human (the aesthetic, the transcendental, the spiritual, the humane).
2. Citizenship: to prepare students to engage in democracy; to be informed; to participate civilly in society and globally. This is the realm of social ethics and justice.

3. Competence: to ensure that students possess skills for success in careers, to successfully face workplace challenges, work in groups, deal with complexity, work across disciplines. This is the professional domain.

Additional take-aways for GRECO were that how to use what we know requires interdisciplinary learning. We need to ask what the curriculum should look like to achieve our goals. People pointed out that we need to articulate an educational philosophy to ourselves and our students. Finally, diversity depends on the global context; there was much talk about the issue of global and local.

Campus climate was an issue that came up at the full-day talk-out by students in December, and was in other ways being raised by students here and elsewhere. GRECO stated that we needed to pay attention to this issue.

RAFFO asked: what does “safe” mean?

GRECO replied that the word meant different things to different students. Some students do not feel safe in their classrooms in discussions. For some students, the presence of armed police was an issue. Some students feel that faculty are not able to relate to them culturally. For some, they do not feel safe expressing opinions in the classroom because of their peers. Students called for cultural competency; at the faculty event, however, it was suggested that an effective route to inclusion cannot be mandated. For GRECO then the question is how to get people to want to become culturally competent. A guiding question should be how to address the specific needs of our student body.

GRECO hoped that the notes from the Winter Symposium, along with this discussion, would help a small group—a committee or task force—to explore the question further. We are doing some things well, and we all as individuals are doing our job, but something in the curriculum as a whole may not be serving the students at our university.

D. HANSEN / GAMBURD **moved** that the Senate resolve itself into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:33).

In the ensuing discussion, numerous senators offered perspectives on the state of education in the University and in the broader community. Common themes were the necessity to meet students where they are at; the urgency of equipping students with requisite skills; and practical problems of assessing proficiencies and defining prerequisites to ensure that students are adequately prepared for studies.

MAIER / RUETER **moved** that the Senate return to regular session; the motion was **approved** without objection (at 4:07).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the University Studies Council listed in **February Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved**, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

2. Motion to Create a Task Force on Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty

B. HANSEN / ELZANOWSKI **moved** the resolution brought by the Steering Committee, contained in **February Agenda Attachment E.2**, to create a task force to explore the issue of a pathway and procedure for granting tenure to teaching-intensive faculty, with a specific charge to the task force and suggested timeline for work.

GRECO referred to the discussion at the previous Senate meeting [during committee of the whole], but invited senators to further speak their mind before voting.

B. HANSEN referred to feedback provided by e-mail by LIEBMAN, who was not present today. LIEBMAN's recommendation was not to kill this before we examine it. HANSEN stated that he had been on both sides of this issue, and that he agreed that killing this before examining it would be a mistake.

RUETER felt, to the contrary, that we should kill it before we examine it because it will not go anywhere. Is more teaching load even being considered? It can be a discussion item, but the task force will be onerous for colleagues.

PADIN rejoined that it might indeed go somewhere, and therefore that a task force should look at the issue and come back with a recommendation.

BLUFFSTONE had received feedback from four faculty in his district: none of them liked the idea. He thought that we should take the prospect of task force seriously. It probably would shift the burden of proof from "Why do this?" to "Why shouldn't we do this?" If the change supports teaching and research, it would be a no-brainer, but he had doubts about this. His view is that we are trying to squeeze as much out of tenure positions as we can; this measure would add another, complicated level of decision-making. It seemed to him not in harmony with where the university has been moving in the last 10-15 years on research.

MACCORMACK observed that the proposal is in the name of academic freedom, and that over half of the faculty do not currently have this freedom. To frame the question as "who will do research?" is to side-step this important issue.

PADIN, responding to previous comments, framed the problem thus: Would the proposal siphon off research positions? If so, then to him it would be a bad idea. Or would it lead to transitions to tenure for positions that are not currently tenured, which are not protected with academic freedom? Then we might feel about it differently, say if we signaled the task force that we wanted a guarantee of this kind. BLUFFSTONE,

replying, said that this would not fundamentally change his position, since he believed we ought to move forward and not merely preserve where we are. He saw each new appointment as a potential academic star, as potentially someone with world-class creative output. That is what puts us on the map and reflects where we want to be in ten or fifteen years. PADIN suggested that the measure was about converting an existing tier to tenure status. BLUFFSTONE wanted to think in terms of institutional aspirations.

MAIER, as a point of order, indicated that during discussion remarks should be directed to the Chair rather than to other members.

B. HANSEN made two observations. The first was that the task force, after exploring the issue, could report back in 2017 with a thumbs down. GRECO interjected: that's right. HANSEN's second observation was the current system allowed flexibility over the course of a career as different elements came to the fore. Would this new system pigeonhole faculty—for example, would a teaching-intensive faculty member be precluded from doing research?

The **question** was **called**; the motion to end discussion passed by voice vote with one nay and the rest aye's.

The original **motion** was **approved** with 25 in favor, 24 opposed, and 2 abstentions (voting by clicker).

GRECO hoped faculty with reservations as well as those who were in favor of the idea would be willing to serve on the task force.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators nor questions from the floor for the chair.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

Connecting to the preceding item, WIEWEL stated that he thought the question, one that had been voiced for some time, was worth considering. He characterized it as one further attempt to bring clarity to the status of non-tenure-track faculty.

WIEWEL reported that winter term enrollment was essentially flat. It was unclear what would happen next year.

There was a continued push for state funding, and on February 11th there would be a joint lobbying day by all seven state universities in Salem. They have been told, however, that they are unlikely to get what they are asking for in this short legislative session.

WIEWEL observed that the finished SP was now available in a variety of formats. A next step would be to look at which units would take responsibility for the various initiatives, and to keep track of progress.

WIEWEL reported that the citizens' committee had filed a ballot measure regarding a payroll tax for PSU funding. This filing created constraints about how PSU employees, as public employees, may discuss the ballot measure. As President, WIEWEL is not allowed to advocate for or against any ballot initiative at any time. Faculty may do advocacy during non-working hours, but not use any University resources (such as e-mail, office supplies, etc.) for this purpose. These same rules apply to another new initiative starting today whereby graduate students are seeking to unionize. Public employees may neither promote nor hinder such unionization efforts on work time or using work resources. (Wearing a button, however, is apparently OK.)

WIEWEL reported briefly on a meeting to follow up on the event held by students of color in December. Task forces on Black student success and Asian-Pacific Islander student success were being initiated, as were requests for campus spaces for those groups. More complicated, but also moving forward, were issues addressing campus climate and the nature of the curriculum. By avoiding extremes of tokenism and hostility, WIEWEL hoped this could be a rich effort addressing significant issues of equity and social change.

2. Provost's Report

[See written handout: **Minutes Appendix G.2.**]

Responding to a question at last Senate meeting on comparative retention rates, ANDREWS pointed to information in her handout from other Oregon public institutions other peer institutions. This information, she observed, is germane to the prior conversation: is it the students that we serve, is it how we teach, is it some combination of these things? What is it that makes our retention rates lower than some of our peer institutions? The question is not just one of numbers, but of what students are learning. This kind of data is necessary to inform the discussion about liberal education.

ANDREWS also noted information on strategies to create a culturally relevant curriculum, course material, pedagogy, and create a good classroom climate. She had received responses to her December blog post and at various department meetings, from faculty and staff offering help or resources for the University to work on this. She encouraged others to contact her if they are interested in doing this. She will blog about a meeting held last week to discuss various strategies. Institutional change will take a collective effort; also, individual schools and colleges are taking steps. There are both internal and external resources to draw upon; for example, the Office of Academic Innovation has been involved in these discussions. Both students and faculty have been actively involved. Several committees, such as the curriculum committees, have already begun to entertain some of these issues.

PADIN said that in looking at the comparative data, and considering the composition of the respective student groups, we need to attend to the value added in each case. We need a more careful analysis, since we may be dealing with different student populations.

ANDREWS agreed, and said that that kind of information could be provided. For example, we could look at how many students at each institution are transfer students. If

people need additional data, let her office know how to drill down to get that data. These numbers [in the handout] are not the only ones that matter.

3. Mid-Year Report of the Faculty Development Committee

This report, submitted by FDC chair David PEYTON, was circulated as **February Agenda Attachment G.3**.

4. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

PADIN reported from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), which comprises members elected from each of the public universities in Oregon. He is one of the three PSU members. The last quarterly meeting was in Eugene on the 22nd and 23rd. IFS has been active in consulting with chairs of higher education committees [in the state legislature] to provide a faculty voice.

One current issue of note, said PADIN, is the accelerated learning work group of the Higher Education Coordinating Committee [HECC]. This group has been exploring, for about a year, ways to award college credit for work done at the high school level. Some draft standards have been developed and there is a period of three months for comment on the draft standards. PADIN stated that IFS is very interested, and that as a voice for faculty they have strong concerns. Referring back to the earlier discussion, PADIN noted that by some measures our [Oregon's] K-12 system is one of the weakest nationwide in delivering high school education. Therefore he believed that the notion that this system should be awarding more college credit is concerning; this would seem to call for improvement of the K-12 system. PADIN asked senators to share with him any thoughts about this issue, or interest in testifying.

PADIN reported that IFS is also participating in a work group around House bill 3308 on work force development. This bill asks HECC to analyze and make recommendations to address disparities in higher education affecting historically marginalized populations.

ANDREWS commented that PSU is the one of the institutions that is concerned about the accelerated learning proposal, particularly the proficiency or competency part of it, for the reasons suggested by PADIN. She characterized our [PSU's] position as one of caution about an aggressive approach to accelerated learning, because we want to ensure that students who have those credits can actually do college-level work. She solicited faculty comments on the proposed standards.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:40 p.m.

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Research Update and Distinguished Faculty Designation

Lisa M. Zurk, Assoc. Vice President
Research and Strategic Partnerships

Jon Fink (Vice President, RSP) and Erin Flynn (AVP, SP)
Alan Kolibaba (AVP, RSP)

Portland State University

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Portland State 2016 Strategic Plan

STRATEGIC GOALS

2

Advance excellence in teaching & research

Attracting and retaining the highest quality faculty and entrusting them with academic freedom is the best means of achieving PSU's mission as a top urban research and teaching university. A renewed emphasis on professional development, strong integration in academic advising and robust shared governance will substantially strengthen the impact of our research. Our level of sponsored research has increased 30% since 2009. Our faculty excels at providing research that enhances and solves problems for the rapidly evolving Portland region. That research has been extended into national and global fields, bringing new and broader attention to PSU.

Objective
Support a diverse faculty to advance teaching and research, honor academic freedom and prioritize investments to ensure relevant and high-quality academic programs. Enhance teaching environments, including curriculum, to ensure inclusion and affirmation for all students.

Initiative 3: Recognize Outstanding Research

3.1 Establish a Distinguished Professor rank to recognize outstanding research, scholarship and creative work.
3.2 Create opportunities for faculty and graduate students to develop and enrich their research efforts.

Assess Recognize Support

RSP - LMZ

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Measuring Excellence in Research - College Metrics

- Goal: quantify the research productivity of the PSU colleges and faculty in those colleges
 - Clearly communicate expectations to faculty, leadership
 - Recognize faculty excellence and achievement!
 - Connect productivity to resources and strategies
- Process: establish a *small* number of quantifiable research metrics (college-dependent)
 - Choose metrics that are *reflective* of excellence, but that can also be *measured* and understood
 - Define baseline levels and research goals (*completed, Fall 2105*)
 - Identify and engage on strategies to increase research performance, and consider strategic investments
 - Measure on quarterly/yearly basis and assess productivity

RSP - LMZ

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Research Productivity: External Funding (FY2015 Expenditures by College)

CUPA:
Center Urban Studies \$1.4M

GSE:
OR Cntr. Career Dev. \$4.2M

MCECS Departments:
Civil Eng. \$2.7M
Computer Sci. \$1.7M
Elect. & Comp. \$1.6M
Mech Eng. \$1.3M

CLAS Departments:
Chemistry \$2.7M
Psychology \$2.3M
Biology \$2.3M
Env. Sci. Mang. \$1.9M
Geology \$1.2M
INS \$1.1M

SSW:
Cntr Imp Child. & Fam. \$8.1M
Reg. Res. Inst. \$6.6M

Research Expenditures for PSU in FY2015 totaled \$58M

- Nationally competitive in some areas of excellence
- External funding enriches campus by supporting graduate students, faculty and staff pay, travel, professional development, and labs/equipment

RSP - LMZ

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Research Impact and Productivity: PhD Student Production (DataMaster)

Doctoral students Graduated 2013-present

Education School
ELC 25
ELPE 16
ELEA 16
ELC 1

Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS)
PSYA 26
CHMD 20
BIOD 15
PHAP 12
ESGN 7
MTED 6
SSGN 6
SOED 4
SOPT 2
SSMA 1
SSBA 1
EES 1

Engineering & Computer Sci.
TECO 18
CS 16
ECE 13
CEEV 7
SWES 15
UST 18
PAF 11
HSP 3
USBS 1

Doctor of Education
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

- Total of 261 students receiving an advanced degree (EdD, PhD).
- Students benefit from a strong research and education environment
 - Many graduate students supported on external funding
- Establishes PSU's recognition as a leader in higher education.

RSP - LMZ

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Research Impact: Publication Citations

Data from 2014 citations as compiled by PSU Library

Publications statistics are a measure of the impact of our contribution to knowledge

RSP - LMZ

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Distinguished Faculty Designation

- Recognition of outstanding members of the PSU faculty (as measured by their scholarship and research)
 - Emerged from Research Task Force (part of Strategic Plan)
 - Modeled on comparable designations nationally
 - Reviewed by PSU provost, deans, and faculty senate steering

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORSHIPS

The Distinguished Professor title at Portland State University is one of the highest honors accorded to a faculty member. This award is given to those who have attained prominence in scholarship and research more than any other individuals recognized to maintain the high standards of scholarship. In addition, they are characterized by a high level of engagement with the community.

Criteria for Selecting University Distinguished Professors

In general, Portland State University Distinguished Professors are recognized nationally for their scholarship. In addition, they are characterized by a high level of engagement with the community.

Recognition

- Portland State University Distinguished Professors will be recognized annually at spring commencement and Fall Convocation, and have an opportunity to give an inaugural lecture.
- Recipients' names and photographs will be prominently displayed in some location on campus and on the PSU website.
- Distinguished Professors will have the opportunity to attend and be recognized at selected University and/or community events at the invitation of the Provost, Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships, and President in recognition of their contributions.
- A yearly stipend of \$2000 will be paid to the individual in addition to their faculty salary.

The Distinguished Faculty designation recognizes our PSU faculty at the highest levels of research impact – other mechanisms of support for junior and developing faculty are also in progress and consideration....

KSP - LMC

Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP)

Commitment to Knowledge and Research

- Portland State University is an unique knowledge resource for the Portland region, the state of Oregon, the nation as a whole, and the international community
 - Inventing, expanding, and applying knowledge is key to our identity ("Let Knowledge Serve the City")
 - Our faculty, students, and staff contributions are enhanced by our institutional commitment to development and recognition of excellence
 - Examples of PSU research support: start-up packages, Faculty Enhancement Grants, travel grants, research excellence awards, graduate student support
- The Strategic Plan suggests building and resourcing a strategy for the continued success and growth of the research enterprise
- Questions or comments:
 - Lisa Zurk, zurkl@pdx.edu

RSP - LMZ

DISCUSSION

What do we expect of our students?
 What should our students know?
 What should a PSU graduate be able to do?
 Where are we succeeding?
 How can we expand on that?
 Where are we failing our students?
 How can we reverse that?

WINTER SYMPOSIUM

- **HUMANITY:** EMPOWER STUDENTS TO BE BETTER PEOPLE/ TO FULFILL THEIR POTENTIAL/ SENSE OF PURPOSE/ UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS TO BE HUMAN/ **aesthetic/ transcendental/ spiritual/ humane**
- **CITIZENSHIP:** PREPARE STUDENTS TO ENGAGE IN A DEMOCRACY/ TO BE INFORMED CITIZENS/ PARTICIPATE CIVILLY IN SOCIETY/ GLOBAL CITIZENS/ **social/ ethical/ civic/ JUSTICE**
- **COMPETENCE:** ENSURE THAT STUDENTS POSSESS THE SKILLS FOR SUCCESS IN THEIR CAREERS / READINESS FOR CHANGING WORKPLACE CHALLENGES/ **professional**

SOME "TAKE-AWAYS"

- How to use what we know requires interdisciplinary learning.
- We need to ask ourselves: what should the curriculum look like to achieve our goals?
- We need a clearly articulated educational philosophy.
- What diversity is depends on the global context.

CAMPUS CLIMATE

- Many students don't feel safe on campus, in their classrooms, in discussions.
- Students call for cultural competency training for faculty.
- Yet an effective route to inclusion cannot be mandated.
- How do we better address the specific needs of our student body?

DISCUSSION

What should a PSU graduate be able to do?
 Where are we succeeding?
 How can we expand on that?
 Where are we failing our students?
 How can we reverse that?

- Whereas the Faculty Senate concurs with the shared desire expressed by the administration and PSU-AAUP to provide increased job security and avenues for promotion for faculty;
- Whereas the Faculty Senate considers especially important the exercise of academic freedom that comes with tenure and thus would like to see a greater percentage of PSU's faculty hired in tenure lines;
- Whereas the Faculty Senate also values the role of the scholar-teacher who participates in a variety of spheres of academic life, thereby enriching the student experience, departmental exchanges and the scholarly conversation within the faculty member's discipline;
- **Be it resolved that the members of the PSU Faculty Senate create a task force to explore the creation of teaching-intensive tenure lines to complement the scholar-teacher lines that must remain primary to departmental composition.**

The charge will be to:

- Research models at other universities.
- Solicit feedback across campus through a variety of means including all-campus forums. At least two forums, scheduled during different teaching blocks, will be organized and publicized to all potential stakeholders, including but not limited to students, all faculty (tenure-line, NTT and adjunct faculty), department chairs, employees responsible for student and/or faculty support, and administrators.
- Provide an interim report to the Faculty Senate on their research and the feedback generated through outreach.
- Review models, feedback from campus and input generated at the Faculty Senate meeting, and formulate a proposal for the creation of teaching-intensive tenure lines at PSU, addressing such topics as expectations for hiring, granting of tenure, promotion, work load, departmental and campus contributions, and suggestions for implementation.
- Hold a second round of campus-wide forums to solicit feedback on the proposal, including Faculty-Senate organized meetings and any additional venues thought useful.
- Revise the proposal based on second round of feedback, then present to the Faculty Senate for its approval to amend the P & T Guidelines, after review by AAUP-PSU and OAA.

The task force will consist of five members appointed by the Senate, two appointed by the administration, and two by PSU-AAUP. The majority of task force members will be tenured faculty.

Let it be noted that these positions are not to be conceived of as subordinate to our current scholar-teacher lines, thus it is expected that these lines would be filled by candidates holding terminal degrees in the field and have equivalent training to that of other tenure line faculty.

Recommended Timeline:**PHASE ONE: RESEARCH/MODELS/ANALYSIS/FEEDBACK**

March 2016: Task force members appointed and the group convened.

Spring 2016: Task force researches models and best practices for awarding tenure for teaching.

Fall 2016: Campus-wide forums held to present results of research and solicit feedback from campus. In addition to forums, feedback solicited online and through other means.

Winter 2017: Task force makes an interim report to Faculty Senate.

PHASE TWO: EXPLORE PSU-SPECIFIC MODEL AND IMPLEMENTATION

Spring 2017: Task force drafts a proposal for the award of tenure for teaching and its implementation at PSU.

Fall 2017: Task force presents its preliminary recommendations to the Faculty Senate and solicits feedback.

Winter 2018: Campus-wide forums held to present the task force's recommendations and solicit feedback widely from across campus. Forums augmented by online and write-in feedback.

Spring 2018: Task force presents its proposal to amend the P&T Guidelines at April meeting of the Faculty Senate, presents draft language at the May meeting, with final approval during June meeting.

February Minutes Appendix G.2

PROVOST ANDREWS' COMMENTS: FEBRUARY 1, 2016 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

DROP-IN CONVERSATIONS WITH THE PROVOST

Winter and Spring dates (<http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/drop-in-conversations-wprovost>)

February 16, 2016, 11:30AM - 12:30PM, SMSU 258

April 15, 2016, 1-2 PM, SMSU 258

May 18, 2016, 12-1 PM, SMSU 258

RETENTION RATES

Last month I shared data on retention rates. Senator Babcock asked how our data compared to other universities in Oregon. See attached response on page 2. See Senate minutes for data presented on January 11th.

STRATEGIES FOR CREATING CULTURAL RELEVANT CURRICULUM, COURSE MATERIALS, PEDAGOGY AND CLASSROOM CLIMATE

Contact me if interested in assisting with this work

My Blog: psuprovostblog.com

Office of Institutional
Research and Planning
January 26, 2016

First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate 6-Year Graduation Rates*
SOURCE: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Reports, Subject Years**

Oregon Public Universities	Fall 2007 Entering Cohort			Fall 2008 Entering Cohort			Fall 2009 Entering Cohort		
	Cohort	# Graduated	Grad Rate	Cohort	# Graduated	Grad Rate	Cohort	# Graduated	Grad Rate
University of Oregon	3,332	2,246	67%	3,505	2,332	67%	4,191	2,884	69%
Oregon State University	2,847	1,734	61%	2,974	1,828	61%	3,006	1,896	63%
Oregon Institute of Technology	277	134	48%	268	119	44%	344	162	47%
Western Oregon University	748	334	45%	916	407	44%	882	413	47%
Portland State University	1,243	518	42%	1,427	595	42%	1,567	659	42%
Eastern Oregon University	351	112	32%	314	73	23%	313	106	34%
Southern Oregon University	703	223	32%	703	258	37%	675	267	40%

PSU Peer Institutions	Fall 2007 Entering Cohort			Fall 2008 Entering Cohort			Fall 2009 Entering Cohort		
	Cohort	# Graduated	Grad Rate	Cohort	# Graduated	Grad Rate	Cohort	# Graduated	Grad Rate
San Diego State University	4,109	2,713	66%	4,506	2,981	66%	3,578	2,361	66%
George Mason University	2,390	1,576	66%	2,174	1,450	67%	2,476	1,656	67%
University of Illinois at Chicago	2,830	1,632	58%	3,272	1,855	57%	2,944	1,757	60%
Western Michigan University	3,531	1,965	56%	3,473	1,907	55%	3,803	2,054	54%
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	3,049	1,691	55%	3,383	1,849	55%	4,002	1,741	44%
University of Toledo	3,253	1,496	46%	3,548	1,632	46%	3,927	1,767	45%
Portland State University	1,243	518	42%	1,427	595	42%	1,567	659	42%
The University of Texas at Arlington	1,974	792	40%	2,096	847	40%	2,254	944	42%
University of Memphis	2,059	823	40%	2,007	867	43%	2,018	888	44%
Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis	2,516	956	38%	2,737	1,150	42%	2,802	1,233	44%

*Graduation rates are calculated as the total number of completers within 150% of normal time, divided by the total number of students in the beginning cohort.

**Includes both undergraduates who have no prior postsecondary experience and those who had earned college credits before graduation from high school. Note: This is different from "transfer students," who earn postsecondary credits between graduating from high school and entering a 4-year institution.

**IPEDS graduation rates compared to PSU's
internal graduation rates**

	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009
IPEDS	42%	42%	42%
PSU*	40%	40%	41%

* PSU internal graduation rate includes freshmen new from high school, with 30 or fewer college credits.

IPEDS includes entering students with college credit earned in high school--could be more than 30 hours.

Source: IPEDS OIRP: Z. Markiss, L. Lu 01/26/2016

Office of the PSU Faculty Senate (OAA)
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Market Center Building 650
tel. 503-725-4416
fax 503-725-4499

To: Provost Andrews
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate
Gina Greco, Presiding Officer
Date: 2 February 2016
Re: Notice of Senate Actions

On 1 February 2016, the Faculty Senate approved the Curricular Consent Agenda recommending the proposed new undergraduate courses, changes to courses, changes to programs, and changes to University Studies clusters listed in Attachment E.1 to the February 2016 Agenda.

2-3-16—OAA concurs with the approval of the Curricular Consent Agenda.

In addition, **the Senate voted to approve:**

The resolution brought by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee regarding creation of a Task Force to Explore Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty, as given in Attachment E.2 to the February 2016 Agenda.

2-3-16—No action needed by OAA on Senate resolutions.

Best regards,



Gina Greco
Presiding Officer



Richard H. Beyler
Secretary to the Faculty



Sona Andrews
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

February 4, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com> and looking in the **2015-16 Comprehensive List of Proposals**.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Change to Existing Programs

E.1.a.1

- MA/MS Mathematics – change to existing program: reduce credits for sequence requirement
FSBC Comments: see wiki

Change to Existing Courses

E.1.a.2

- CR 511 Research Methods in Conflict Resolution, 4 credits – change course credits from 4 to variable 2-4

E.1.a.3

- WR 514 Poetry Writing, 4 credits – change course title to Graduate Poetry Writing; change course description; change concurrent enrollment; change repeatability; change grading option

E.1.a.4

- WR 521 MFA Core Workshop in Fiction, 4 credits – change course repeatability

E.1.a.5

- WR 522 MFA Core Workshop in Poetry, 4 credits – change course repeatability

School of Social Work

New Courses

E.1.a.6

- SW 549 Spirituality in Social Work Practice, 3 credits
Explore the spiritual and religious diversity of clients and communities and its role in individual, group and community life. Identify and apply a framework of knowledge, values

and practice methodologies to conducting bio-psychosocial spiritual assessments within a wide range of social work practice settings.

E.1.a.7

- SW 553 Racial Disparities, 3 credits

E.1.a.8

- SW 559 Community and Organization Research, 3 credits
Prepares for mezzo and macro research practices to create the evidence base for social change (building the research base to advance reforms), strengthening organizations (designing and using program evaluation to improve programs and organizations), and building the voice and influence of marginalized communities (including local and regional communities and organizational service users).

E.1.a.9

- SW 584 Intimate Partner Violence, 3 credits
Aims to (re)introduce theories, interventions, research, and complex issues associated with intimate partner violence (IPV). Students will be asked to explore the intersections of micro and macro violence to better understand the influence of state and structural violence on the lives of individuals and communities, particularly those from racialized groups.

College of Urban and Public Affairs

Change to Existing Programs

E.1.a.10

- MURP Urban and Regional Planning – change to existing program: eliminate required specialization area
FSBC Comments: see wiki

E.1.a.11

- MUS Urban Studies and Planning – change to existing program: change degree requirements
FSBC Comments: see wiki

New Courses

E.1.a.12

- USP 657 Advanced Data Analysis: Discrete Choice Modeling, 3 credits
Presents the theory and practice underlying the formulation and estimation of models of individual discrete choice behavior with applications to travel, travel related and other choices. Provides students with an understanding of the theory, methods, application and interpretation of multinomial logit (MNL), nested logit and other members of the Generalized Extreme Value (GEV) family of models, as well as an introduction to mixed logit models.

February 4, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
Chair, Graduate Council

Robert Fountain
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com> and looking in the **2015-16 Comprehensive List of Proposals**.

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.b.1

- CE 420/520 Advanced Mechanics of Materials, 4 credits – drop.

E.1.b.2

- CE 421/521 Analysis of Framed Structures, 4 credits – drop.

E.1.b.3

- CE 456/556 Traffic Engineering, 4 credits – drop.

E.1.b.4

- CE 464/564 Hydrologic and Hydraulic Modeling, 4 credits – drop.

E.1.b.5

- CE 467/567 Hydrologic and Hydraulic Design, 4 credits – drop.

E.1.b.6

- CS 438/538 Computer Architecture, 4/3 credits – change prereqs

E.1.b.7

- CS 454/554 Software Engineering, 4/3 credits – change prereqs

E.1.b.8

- ECE 436/536 Applications in Electromagnetics, Optics and Acoustics, 4 credits – drop.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Courses

E.1.b.9

- SPHR 471/571 Neurolinguistics, 4 credits

Neurolinguistics introduces the study of the relationship between linguistic processes and the human brain. Learn about language processing from psychological and neurological perspectives. Expected preparation includes a course in neuroanatomy (SPHR 461 or equivalent). Introductory understanding of linguistics and psychology is strongly recommended (Introduction to Linguistics and Introduction to Psychology). Prerequisites: SpHr 461 or equivalent.

Change to Existing Courses

E.1.b.10

- AR 421/521 Extemporized-Sung Poetry and Folk Songs of the Arabs, 4 credits – change course description; change prereqs

E.1.b.11

- AR 427/527 Advanced Classical Arabic: Prose, 4 credits – change course title to Classical Arabic Prose; change prereqs

E.1.b.12

- GER (484)/584 German Stylistics, 4 credits – add 400-level section

E.1.b.13

- MTH 41/511, 412/512, 413/513 Introduction to Real Analysis I, II, III, 3 credits – change course description

E.1.b.14

- WR 412/512 Advanced Fiction Writing, 4 credits – separate from 400-level section; change course title to Graduate Fiction writing; change prereqs; change concurrent enrollment; change repeatability; change grade option

E.1.b.15

- WR 428/528 Advanced News Writing, 4 credits – change course title to Advanced Media Writing; change course description; change prereqs; change concurrent enrollment

College of Urban and Public Affairs

New Courses

E.1.b.16

- PS 477/577 Global Food Politics and Policy, 4 credits
Politics and policy of food production and consumption in both rich and poor nations. Review of competing policy arguments across issues relating to food security, markets and market access, and the environment and public health. Prerequisites: upper-division standing or graduate standing.

See also Attachment E.1.c.1

February 9, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Fountain
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com> and looking in the **2015-16 Comprehensive List of Proposals**.

College of the Arts

Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.1 **Considered under separate discussion: see attachment E.1.c.1**

- BA/BS in Art History – change program requirements.

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.2

- BS in Computer Science – change program requirements.

New Courses

E.1.c.3

- CS 320 Principles of Programming Languages (4)
Syntax and semantics. Compilers and interpreters. Programs as data. Regular expressions and context free grammars. Programming paradigms, including procedural, functional, and object-oriented programming. Type systems, including dynamic and static typing disciplines. Binding, scope, data abstraction, and modularity. Denotational, operational, and axiomatic semantics. Introduction to program correctness. Prerequisites: CS 202 and CS 251 and CS 311.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.4

- CE 371 Environmental Engineering – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.5

- CS 321 Languages and Compiler Design I – change course number to CS 421; change title, description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.6

- CS 322 Languages and Compiler Design II – change course number to CS 422; change title, description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.7

- CS 445 Machine Learning – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.8

- CS 469 Software Engineering Capstone – change title to *Software Engineering Capstone I*; description, prerequisites, grading option.

E.1.c.9

- CS 470 Software Engineering Capstone – change title to *Software Engineering Capstone II*; description, prerequisites, grading option.

E.1.c.10

- ECE 101 Exploring Electrical Engineering – change description, lecture hours, lab hours, prerequisites, concurrent enrollment.

E.1.c.11

- ECE 102 Engineering Computation – change description, lecture hours, lab hours, prerequisites.

E.1.c.12

- ECE 271 Digital Systems – change course number to ECE 172; change description.

E.1.c.13

- ECE 341 Introduction to Computer Hardware – change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.14

- ECE 371 Microprocessors – change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.15

- ECE 412 Senior Project Development I – change description, credit hours from 4 to 3.

E.1.c.16

- ECE 413 Senior Project Development II – change description, credit hours from 2 to 3.

E.1.c.17

- ECE 425 Digital Integrated Circuit Design I – change prerequisites.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.18

- Minor in World Language – add Hebrew to minor.

New Courses

E.1.c.19

- Viet 101, 102, 103 First-Year Vietnamese TM1, TM2, TM3 (4,4,4)
Elementary work in the Vietnamese language with emphasis on listening comprehension, speaking, grammatical patterns, reading, and writing. Includes discussions of Vietnamese culture and traditions. Suitable for beginners and Vietnamese speakers with limited ability. This is a sequence of three: Viet 101, Viet 102, and Viet 103.

E.1.c.20

- WLL 319 Fairy Tales and Folklore (4)
A study of the fairy tale, folklore and/or other works originating orally representing a range of critical social and cultural issues. May be repeated with different topics. Course taught in English.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.21

- Bi 336 Cell Biology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.22

- ESM 221 Applied Environmental Studies: Problem Solving – change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.23

- Mth 261 Introduction to Linear Algebra – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.24

- Ph 261 General Astronomy I – change course number to Ph 361; change description.

E.1.c.25

- Ph 262 General Astronomy II – change course number to Ph 362; change description.

College of Urban and Public Affairs

New Courses

E.1.c.26

- UPA 425 CUPA Dean's Seminar (4)
Explore, connect and apply major theories and practices associated with urban and public affairs. Focus on issues of community resilience based in democratic participation for positive community change. Prerequisite: Senior standing.

Attachment E.1.c.1

NOTE: not consent agenda

February 9, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Fountain
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Discussion Items

The following proposals have been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com> and looking in the **2015-16 Comprehensive List of Proposals**.

College of the Arts

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.1

- ArH 204 History of Western Art – change title to *Global History of Art I*; change description to: Survey of the visual arts from prehistoric art to the present. Selected works of painting, sculpture, architecture, and other arts are studied in relation to the cultures that produced them. ArH 204: Prehistoric through Early Medieval art.

E.1.c.2

- ArH 205 History of Western Art – change title to *Global History of Art II*; change description to: Survey of the visual arts from prehistoric art to the present. Selected works of painting, sculpture, architecture, and other arts are studied in relation to the cultures that produced them. ArH 205: Late Medieval through Early Modern art.

E.1.c.3

- ArH 206 History of Western Art – change title to *Global History of Art III*; change description to: Survey of the visual arts from prehistoric art to the present. Selected works of painting, sculpture, architecture, and other arts are studied in relation to the cultures that produced them. ArH 206: Modern and Contemporary art.

February 4, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following proposal has been approved by the Graduate Council, and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com> and looking in the 2015-16 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

School of Business Administration

New Program

- Graduate Certificate in Global Supply Chain Management
(two-page summary attached)

FSBC Comments: see wiki

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR
GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN GLOBAL SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT

Overview

The area of Global Supply Chain Management (GSCM) has evolved greatly in the past ten years. Globalization, the complexity of trade, and the emersion of Asia as the world's factory has increased the need for business professionals who can lead across borders and cultures.

This emerging importance of efficient supply chains is an important growth segment in the regional economy with a number of PSU supply chain graduates working in this discipline. However, despite the SBA's degreed offerings in Global Supply Chain Management, students in other programs seeking electives and community members that want specific supply chain skills are not able to participate unless they enroll in an entire master's or undergraduate program. The online certificate in GSCM is designed for people who want a subset of courses or are enrolled in another graduate program and select GSCM as their elective track.

The certificate proposal has been reviewed by industry leaders, who have expressed support and offered input on aligning course offerings and the structure of the certificate with industry and employee needs. The individuals are executives from different vertical markets, yet all have needs for GSCM skills. These companies include Nike, Intel, Boeing, and Blount among many. Engagement with the industry will continue on an ongoing basis to assure the relevance of certificate course offerings to employees and job seekers (many of whom are, or will be, PSU graduates).

Evidence of Need

The certificate was crafted by a group of supply chain faculty and Business Advisory Board members who have strong connections with regional vertical industries such as aerospace and athletic and outdoor products. It is the outcome of discussions within that group that student and industry needs were considered regarding different curricular possibilities. To objectively assess market demand for the certificate, the SBA faculty collected information about: industry employment trends, supply chain certificates and graduate programs at other universities, and the assessments of need (collected from interviews and surveys) offered by industry executives and managers from major regional employers.

The results of the research showed that the employment forecast for GSCM graduates has increased dramatically in the past ten years. Currently in the Portland Metro area, there are over 650 posted job openings in GSCM. As a result of this demand, there is currently nearly 100% placement of graduates in both undergraduate and graduate Supply Chain programs currently at PSU.

Of the business-related majors, supply chain is one of 10 most in-demand degrees, which include finance (57.4%), accounting (56.1%), business administration and management (47.5%), marketing (41.7%), *supply chain management* (39%), and management information systems (39%). In addition, growth in the GSCM master's program has doubled in just 3 years.

The certificate program fills a need at the graduate level for students who want a smaller program and for students in other master's programs who want to specialize in GSCM. Many of these students are already working in the supply chain field, but know only one aspect of GSCM. This certificate will help round out their knowledge in this growing segment of business.

Program Objectives

The certificate will improve the fundamental and applied knowledge of students in graduate degree programs by improving GSCM skills and enhancing their competitiveness on the job market. It will offer current industry employees an opportunity to enrich their training and advance their careers. It will provide employers with a new option for employee training and workforce development. And it will allow post-baccalaureate students to improve their job prospects and explore PSU graduate degree offerings prior to committing to a program. Lastly it will provide members of the MBA program offered in the SBA a new elective track.

Course of study

The certificate builds on six existing courses. Implementing program objectives, the certificate requirements include the courses listed below. Students will be able to take the online courses either full-time or part-time.

Proposed Curriculum & Schedule:

Total requirements: 16 SCH; Pick 4 of the following 6 courses

GSCM 511 Principles of Strategic Global Sourcing (fall)
GSCM 513 Principles of Strategic Global Logistics (Winter)
GSCM 516 Global Supply Chain Forecasting and Production Planning (Winter)
GSCM 517 Supply Chain International Field Study (Summer)
GSCM 521 Global Information, Systems and Data Analytics (Fall)
GSCM Elective (Winter & Spring)

There are no prerequisites for these courses and they may be taken in any order.
The elective must be an online course approved by the program Director.

Learning Outcomes

The certificate is designed to provide students with three distinct categories of knowledge and experience. These are (1) fundamental knowledge of global supply chains, (2) focal knowledge of the interconnected nature of supply chains, and (3) specialized skills that enhance the communications with business organizations made up of diverse cultures and locations.

Cost and Organization

There are no new budgetary resource requirements to instruct the SBA courses, as these courses already exist. There are no other resource (e.g., library) requirements. Expected enrollment is 15-20 current students per year range and 15 new students per year expected. It is estimated that there will be a 50-50 split between current degree seeking students and certificate only new students. Current faculty will offer the courses. Administrative support will be provided by existing staff in SBA, which will initially serve as the primary point of student contact. An advisory committee will be made up of PSU faculty, students, alumni, and industry representatives from public, private, and non-profit employers. Per the RCAT, net revenue generated by the certificate is expected to be \$133K for the SBA.

February 4, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Fountain
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of UCC for Faculty Senate

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com> and looking in the [2015-16 Comprehensive List of Proposals](#).

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Program

Minor in Conflict Resolution (Summary attached)

FSBC comments: See the Curriculum Tracking wiki for comments.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR

Minor in Conflict Resolution

Overview:

The Minor in Conflict Resolution encompasses a broad introduction to the theoretical and practical competencies of the field. The coursework is a beginning foundation for the student seeking employment or more advanced degrees in the field of Conflict Resolution, including PSU's current Master's Degree in Conflict Resolution, and our conjointly proposed Major in Conflict Resolution. The Minor is intended to give students a more focused discussion of conflict resolution than is offered in other University courses, where these skills are beginning to be considered as a higher education core competency. Students with this degree will gain crucial skills when seeking employment in Human Resources, Advocacy, Social Services or other fields of employment that require conflict management competencies.

Required coursework will give students a survey of the range of subject matter within the field and will allow students to choose from amongst other available courses to fit individual academic and career objectives. For example, students may tend toward humanitarian work, mediation, advocacy or other conflict resolution-related study and field work, and can design their Minor toward a general knowledge of the field or toward more directed focus, that can be further developed in further study.

Evidence of Need:

For documented evidence of need, please refer to the PSU Curriculum Tracker wiki page [Minor in Conflict Resolution \(201504\)](#), [Appendix: Documented Evidence of Need](#).

Course of Study:

Undergraduate Minor in Conflict Resolution
(Department of Conflict Resolution)

CR 301U	Intro to Conflict Resolution	4
CR 302U	Intro to Peace Studies	4
CR 303U	Consensus Building	4
CR 304U	Participating in Democracy	4
CR 305U	Ecology of War & Peace	4
CR 306U	Intro to Nonviolence	4
CR 307	Conflict Skills	4
	total	28

EPC Motion: Creation of a PSU STEM Institute

Motion: The Educational Policy Committee moves that the PSU Faculty Senate approve the creation of a PSU STEM Institute

The full proposal materials, including appendices, are available on PSU's Curriculum Tracker, following the link for the Educational Policy Committee, or at this link:

<https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/95963381/STEM%20Institute%20%28201502%29>

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

This is a proposal for the creation of an Institute to coordinate PSU research and educational practices across colleges with an aim of increasing the population of students entering, persisting, and successfully completing university degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math. The proposal originates in the work of the PSU STEM Task Force, and in the work of the Cradle to Career Initiative convened by the Provost's office in 2010.

This campus-wide momentum has been primarily led by faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Maseeh College of Engineering, and the Graduate School of Education working within the STEM Task Force towards a coordinated momentum. The Dean of CUPA wholeheartedly offers his endorsement as well.

Ideas arising from these faculty efforts subsequently took a decisive step forward with the award of a 5-year grant from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) Education Program to support the creation of a PSU Institute.

The work of our faculty culminating in various reports, the HHMI grant, and finally, and this proposal for the creation of a PSU STEM Institute, is a response to various compelling concerns:

1. A shortage in Oregon (and nationally) of students preparing for careers in science, technology, engineering and math.
2. The flip side of #1: an unrealized large pool of young talent whose potential to enter, succeed, and find a vocation and fulfillment in science, technology, engineering, and math careers.
3. An especially large pool of unrealized talent among historically under-represented minorities.
4. A need to disseminate proven pedagogical practices, and forms of student support, of well-established effectiveness in helping students enter and succeed in STEM fields—across departments and colleges at PSU, and outwards, towards the K-12 schools in our region.
5. The desirability of PSU faculty also leading the way in research and testing of innovative and effective pedagogical practices.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE EVALUATION

EPC received a proposal for the creation of a PSU STEM Institute late in academic year 2015. The proposal was first reviewed in the fall of 2015. EPC raised questions on matters of interest to the faculty, requested clarifications, and met with the principal to discuss the proposal. The concept was compelling, but the first submission raised questions, and had loose ends that needed refinement before EPC could recommend bringing the proposal to the floor of the Faculty Senate. EPC therefore asked the principals to revise and re-submit the proposal.

The final, revised proposal was received by EPC in January 2016; it was reviewed carefully, and received very favorably. At its February 8, 2016, meeting EPC voted unanimously to approve a motion recommending Faculty Senate approve the creation of PSU STEM Institute.

BUDGET COMMITTEE STATEMENT (February 4, 2016)

Current Costs

A Howard Hughes Medical Institute multi-year grant is currently paying for much of the costs of the work the Institute would be doing. It includes personnel costs, tuition remissions, GA stipends, travel, hosting workshops, equipment, and lab renovations.

Project costs not covered by the grant are:

- The director's salary, which is being paid by PSU. Its commitment is approximately \$150,000 annually and was established in an MOU with OAA.
- Classified staff time, which is contributed by Chemistry.
- Some indirect expenditures and adjustments for inflation.

Grant expenditures are expected to be about \$365,000 in the final year of the grant (FY19). The MOU with OAA commits funding for the director's position through this same period.

Future Costs

No university funding is being requested beyond FY19. According to the proposal, the STEM Institute will be a self-supporting unit. Funding to support the activities of the Institute will be sought through external grants and gifts.

Costs to the university beyond year FY19 will take the form of cost sharing for grants secured through the institute.

To: Faculty Senate

Date: February 8, 2016

From: Michele Miller & Megan McLaughlin, co-chairs of Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC)
Dave Kinsella, chair of Graduate Council

Re: Proposed Clarification to the Incomplete Grade Policy

Impetus for Update to Policy

The Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) and Graduate Council (GC), in consultation with the Office of the Registrar (RO) and Graduate Studies (OGS) are proposing updates to the Incomplete Policy in order to 1) streamline the current policy, criteria and guidelines into a more concise document and 2) introduce a substantive change in response to an ongoing point of confusion for students and faculty.

- The main point of ambiguity relates to how much coursework (i.e. weeks of attendance, participation, material covered, etc.) must be completed by the student before an Incomplete grade can be given. RO and OGS field a lot of questions from instructors requesting clarity on the parameters for assigning an Incomplete in terms of time frames (i.e. in the first few weeks, half-way through the term, only after the withdrawal period has ended?)
- The current policy only states that “essential work remains to be done” and does not provide clear meaning for what this term means.
- We see many instances where students are given I-grades in the original course when very little coursework has been completed (i.e. student stops coming to class after just a few class meetings). Students are sometimes told to “sit through” the same class the next time it is offered, presumably as a way of making up the Incomplete.
 - In some cases students will sit through the future class without registering, which causes problems with access to D2L, creates incorrect seat counts in classes, and creates a situation where the University does not have a record of who is actually attending class.
 - In other cases, the student will receive an Incomplete grade in the original course and ALSO register for the course again in the future. This creates erroneous duplication in registration/transcripts requiring clean up through appeals to SSC and GC to drop the original course.
 - SSC and GC see petitions to make exceptions to the 1-year Incomplete deadline because the student is “making up” the course by sitting in over a year later because that was the next time the course was taught.
- We also see many students in the RO/OGS offices who are simply confused and need direction on how to ‘finish’ their Incomplete because they did not have a written agreement with the faculty who originally assigned the Incomplete.

Proposal Vetting & Feedback -

The draft proposal was shared with A&A Deans, department chairs and with the advising community for input. The feedback from these groups, which included robust faculty advisor response, was overwhelmingly in agreement that such clarification was needed. Specifically there was strong support for requiring that a substantial portion of the course be completed before allowing an Incomplete grade. There was also strong consensus against the practice of having the student sit in on future course sections as a way of completing the Incomplete.

A Sampling of Student Participation Parameters for Incomplete at Other Institutions)**University of Oregon**

“quality of the work is satisfactory, but some minor yet essential work remains”

University of Washington

“only when the student has been in attendance and has done satisfactory work until within two weeks of the end of the quarter”

University of Denver

“the student’s work to date is passing, and attendance has been satisfactory through at least 60% of the term”

University of Maryland

“UG students must have completed 60 percent or more of the course requirements with a C or better”

University of Arizona

“all but a minor portion of the course work has been satisfactorily completed”

Proposed Incomplete Grade Policy (substantive changes from current policy are highlighted)

Students do not have a right to receive/demand an Incomplete grade. The option of assigning an Incomplete grade is at the discretion of the instructor when the following criteria are met.

Eligibility Criteria

- 1. Required satisfactory course completion/participation.** The quality of the work is satisfactory, but some essential work remains. In addition, the student must have successfully completed most of the course work at the time the student requests the Incomplete , with a minimum grade up to that point of a C- for undergraduate, or B- for a graduate level course.
- 2. Reasonable justification for request.** Reasons for assigning the Incomplete must be acceptable by the instructor. A student does not have the right to demand an Incomplete. The circumstances should be unforeseen or be beyond the control of the student. The instructor is entitled to request appropriate medical or other documentation to validate the student's request.
- 3. Incomplete grade is not a substitute for a poor grade.** The Incomplete grade is not meant to create the opportunity for special or additional work for a student to raise a poor grade, or for the opportunity to take the course over by sitting in on the course in a later term without registering or paying for it.
- 4. Written agreement.** A written or electronic agreement will be endorsed by both the instructor and student. The document will specify a) the remaining work to be completed, b) the highest grade which may be awarded upon submission of remaining items, and c) the date which the missing work is due. The latter may not exceed one year from the end of the term for enrollment for the given course. A template "Incomplete Contract" is available on Registrar's website.
- 5. Resolving the Incomplete.** Instructors may not encourage students to "sit in" an entire future course in order to resolve the Incomplete grade. If the student needs to retake the entire course, they should be given the grade presently earned, and must formally register for the future class they will be attending. If the missed portion of the course is no longer available, instructors may offer an alternative assignment. Grading weight of the alternative assignment should not exceed the original assignment. Students are fully responsible for monitoring all due dates.

Other Rules:

- 1. GPA Calculation:** Incomplete grades are not included when calculating GPA.
- 2. Deadline for Completion:** The deadline for completion of an Incomplete is one calendar year. The instructor may set a shorter deadline, which is binding. Any request for a longer deadline must be requested via petition to the Scholastic Standards Committee or Graduate Council.
- 3. Failure to make up an Incomplete by the end of one year:**

- a. Undergraduate Incomplete Grades: The mark of “I” will automatically change to a grade of “F” or “NP”, depending on the grading option chosen by the student upon registration. If the Incomplete converts to an F, the F grade is included in calculating GPA.
 - b. Graduate Incomplete Grades: The Incomplete will become part of the permanent record for a graduate course.
- 4. **Graduating Undergraduate Students:** Incompletes awarded in undergraduate courses taken in Fall 2006 or later will automatically change to a grade of “F” or “NP” before conferral of the degree. The faculty of record may submit a grade change no later than 30 days after the degree is awarded. Grades of “F” or “NP” will remain on the academic record after this period and cannot be removed.

Budget Committee

Winter Quarter Report

5 February 2016

Members: Ron Babcock (Music), Mirela Blekic (University Studies), Todd Bodner (Psychology), Michael Bowman (Library, co-chair), Elisabeth Ceppi (English), Mitchell Cruzan (Biology), Marek Elzanowski (Mathematics & Statistics, Fall only), Michele Gamburd (Anthropology), David Hansen (Business Administration), Courtney Hanson (Graduate Studies), Jim Hook (Maseeh College), Gerardo Lafferriere (Mathematics & Statistics, co-chair), José Padín (Sociology, EPC chair, ex-officio), Michael Paruszkiewicz (Northwest Economic Research Center), Candyce Reynolds (Educational Leadership & Policy), Alex Sager (Philosophy), Michael Taylor (Social Work).

Consultants: Sona Andrews (OAA), David Burgess (OIRP), Andria Johnson (BO), Kathi Ketchison (OIRP), Scott Marshall (OAA), Gil Miller (OAA), Kevin Reynolds (FADM).

This report covers Fall quarter and the first five weeks of Winter quarter.

Committee Charge & Roles

The Budget Committee has a multipart charge:

1. Consult with the President and his or her designee(s) and make recommendations for the preparation of the annual and biennial budgets.
2. Recommend budgetary priorities.
3. Analyze budgetary implications of new academic programs or program changes through the review of a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long term financial viability of the program, and report this to the Senate.
4. Analyze budgetary implications of the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities through the review of a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long term financial viability of the unit, and report this to the Senate.
5. Consult regarding changes from budgets as prepared.
6. Review expenditures of public and grant funding as requested by the Faculty Senate.
7. Recommend to the President and to the Senate policies to be followed in implementing any declaration of financial exigency.
8. Report to the Senate at least once each year.

The Committee would like to bring a Constitutional amendment to the floor later this year to add a ninth item to the charge about our liaison role with the Deans regarding college and school budgets and enrollment and resource plans.

Divisional representatives on the Committee are responsible for liaising with their Dean. We also liaise with the Honors College, IELP and University Studies (all of the revenue generating units). All divisions other than CLAS have only one representative, so this year another Committee member has volunteered to liaise with each of the revenue generating units, so one person is not solely responsible for the relationship. This process has been considerably more successful than in the two prior years.

FY17 OAA Budget Process

Scott Marshall hosted a day and a half workshop during the Summer to review the OAA enrollment management and budget process and discuss potential changes. Michael Bowman and Gerardo Lafferriere attended for the Budget Committee. As a result of the workshop, a Core IPEB (Integrated Planning of Enrollment and Budget) Team has been formed to propose revisions to the process and the tools. These then go to the Strategic IPEB Team for approval. Michael Bowman is a member of the Strategic IPEB Team. The final report from the workshop is [available online](#).

The OAA budget process has revenue generating units develop two plans, the enrollment plan and the resource plan. Enrollment plans detail those programs where a unit believes that it can generate growth and details the additional resources required to generate this growth. Resource plans lay out other requests for additional resources to increase revenue or to reduce historic inequities. This year, the development of revenue generators' enrollment plans and resource plans are being done simultaneously. Development began at the beginning of the academic year with initial plans submitted in November. The Budget Committee reviewed the plans and provided feedback for OAA and the Deans at two meetings in November and December. Plans are being revised and will be finalized in March.

University Budget

The Budget Committee received an update from Kevin Reynolds and Andria Johnson on the University's FY16 budget and actuals, and on prospects for FY17 and beyond. The slides from that presentation are [available online](#).

The Legislature increased its appropriation to higher education by 22% for the current biennium. Last year, HECC adopted the Student Success and Completion Model which alters how money is distributed between the public universities. The new distribution is being phased in over a few years and shifts funds in PSU's favor.

The University had projected a 2% increase in revenues for this year. However, Summer enrollment was down significantly and Fall and Winter enrollments are flat. An increase in nonresident student enrollment will probably enable the University to meet its revenue target.

For FY17, the University is planning that each division will receive its current budget plus 2–4%. This planning includes a 7% increase in state appropriations (from the new model and the slightly higher budget one receives in the second year of a biennium) and a tuition increase. Each division will need to cover increased costs (such as salary increases and the implementation of the Oregon Sick Leave Law) from this budget increase. As it did this year, the University is adding \$6 million to Central Reserves. Total University reserves (Central Reserves + all units' reserves) going into the current fiscal year was \$45 million.

For future years, cost drivers will be increased PEBB and PERS costs (particularly due to the PERS COLA court decision last year), continuing to build reserves, and strategic investments. [National trends](#) indicate the number of students in higher education will increase in coming years.

November's proposed ballot measure, if approved, would generate revenue that could only be used for scholarships for Metro district area students with demonstrated financial need; to hire and retain advisors, counselors and tutors; to hire and retain full- and part-time faculty; to create an emergency fund for students that experience a hardship; and to pay for the collection, distribution and oversight of the payroll tax. It would run from 2017–24.

Proposal Reviews

The Committee has handled reviews differently this year. New programs are being reviewed by two person review panels. Program revisions are being initially reviewed by Michael Bowman, Courtney Hanson, and Gerardo Lafferriere. Revised programs that appear to have more than a minor budgetary impact are assigned to a review panel.

Unit change proposals continue to be discussed by the Committee as a whole.

The Committee has asked OAA to add the requirement for budget spreadsheets for the first four years of a program, and for first year and fifth year RCATs to the checklist for new programs. This helps the Committee evaluate program costs. The RCATs show us the impact on other colleges and schools of a new program. The budget spreadsheets show more detailed costs to help us better understand a program's cost structure.

Attachment G.5

Educational Policy Committee Winter Quarter Report 2016

Members: Barbara Brower (GEO), Rowana Carpenter (UNST), Ramin Farahmandpour (GSE), Steve Harmon (OAA), Theresa Kaimanu (for G.L.A. Harris) (CUPA), Arthur Hendriks (LIB), Alison Heryer (COTA), Michael Hulshof-Schmidt (SSW), Alastair Hunt (ENG), Paul Latiolais (MATH), José Padín (SOC, chair), Stephanie Roulon (WLL), David Raffo (SBA), Ken Stedman (BIO), Michael Bowman (ex-officio, BC co-chair), Gerardo Lafferriere (ex officio, BC co-chair)

The Constitutional Charge of the Educational Policy Committee

The charge and responsibilities of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) are spelled out in Section 4.4(i) of the Faculty Governance Guide. EPC is an advisory body to the President and the Senate on matters of educational policy and planning. The Faculty Governance Guide breaks down the charge of the EPC as follows:

1. On its own initiative, EPC is to take notice of significant developments bearing on educational policy and planning, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
2. By referral from the President, faculty committees, the Faculty Senate, the EPC is to prepare recommendations on educational policy and planning.
3. In consultation with appropriate Faculty committees, EPC is to recommend long-term University plans and priorities.
4. EPC evaluates, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate, regarding proposals for the creation, major alteration, or abolition of academic units (department, programs, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, and other significant academic entities).

Winter 2016 Activity

1. Proposal for the Creation of a STEM Institute

Motion to recommend, unanimously approved 2/8/16.

2. Criminal Justice Proposal to Change from Division to Department

Motion to recommend, unanimously approved 2/8/16.

3. Political Science Proposal to Change from Division to Department

Motion to recommend, unanimously approved 2/8/16.

4. Public Administration Proposal to Change from Division to Department

Motion to recommend, unanimously approved 2/8/16.

5. Creation for the Creation of Pre-Baccalaureate Certificates

EPC subcommittee met with ARC chair, Alan MacCormack, and agreed on a tentative framework for a motion to Faculty Senate. Main concern: Guidelines to maintain academic quality of courses created for Pre-Baccalaureate certificates.